

SUBMITTED TESTIMONY OF

**FRANK J. GAFFNEY, JR.
PRESIDENT OF THE CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY**

**BEFORE
THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND
NONPROLIFERATION**

7 SEPTEMBER 2006

“ISLAMOFASCISM AND THE WAR FOR THE FREE WORLD”

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to be afforded the opportunity to contribute to this Committee’s deliberations about what is, arguably, the most important issues of our time: the nature of the conflict in which we find ourselves and what it will take for us to prevail in it.

Clarity about the Enemy

This war is not just about Iraq, any more than it is simply a “war on terror.” To be sure, we are fighting in Iraq and we are contending with the use of terror as an asymmetric weapon. It is, however, a serious misunderstanding of the nature of this war – and a grave disservice to the American people – to confine our thinking about it just to the theater or front that is Iraq and what we “do” about it in isolation. The same is true of the characterization that our enemy is “terror” or “terrorists.”

Rather, we are in the midst of the latest in a series of death-struggles between, on the one hand, a totalitarian ideology bent on world domination and the destruction of all who stand in the way of that goal and, on the other, freedom-loving peoples. I call it the War for the Free World.

As President Bush and his senior subordinates have pointed out in recent days, contemporary totalitarians have much in common with their predecessors, the Fascists, Nazis and Communists. For example, today’s enemies amount to an ideological vanguard or cadre that constitute a relatively small percentage of a much larger population. Like their forerunners, today’s totalitarians seek to dominate the latter through violence, coercion and indoctrination. As ever, propaganda, repression, financial rewards and the prospect of future glory are used to establish and maintain effective control of the base. Once that has been accomplished, our generation’s totalitarians will inevitably attempt to conquer other populations and lands, as well.

There is, of course, an important difference between the current crop of totalitarians and their predecessors: Those that threaten us most immediately cloak their cause, and justify their aggressive behavior, with a patina of religion. For this reason, I believe they are most accurately described as “Islamofascists” (or Islamist, for short). President Bush has used a variation on the theme, calling them “Islamic fascists.”

Why the Ideological Aspect Matters

It is imperative to appreciate the ideological character of our enemy for two reasons:

First, recognizing that we are up against a totalitarian political movement permits a strategically vital distinction to be drawn between the vast majority of Muslims around the world who practice their faith in a tolerant, peaceable manner, consistent with the laws and values of civil societies, and the Islamofascists who do not. The latter seek to subjugate such Muslims and non-Muslims alike under a Taliban-style form of repressive religious rule they describe as *Shari'a*.

Clarity on this point is made more difficult by three factors: 1) the concerted efforts of some to obscure this distinction (about which I will have more to say in a moment); 2) the fact that Islamofascists find in some passages of the Koran and certain traditions in Islam justification for their behavior; and 3) by the success the Islamofascists have had in suppressing public expressions of opposition from Muslims who do not subscribe to their Islamist creed. For the moment, however, such a distinction clearly does exist and it behooves us to help Muslim opponents of the Islamofascists survive and prevail over our common foes.

Secondly, recognizing that we are up against a totalitarian ideology is essential to the adoption of instruments of warfare appropriate to defeating its adherents. The U.S. military and our homeland defenders have important roles to play in carrying the fight to the enemy and protecting us against their predations here. They must be equipped with the wherewithal to do so.

For the former, this requires a substantial and sustained ramp-up in defense spending, sufficient personnel and training and the steady support of the American people for the troops and their mission. The latter must be given intelligence, law enforcement and civil defense tools of sufficient quality, utility and flexibility to meet the dynamic threats of today and tomorrow. I would put in this category measures like those contained in the Patriot Act, the recently disclosed Terrorism Surveillance Program and bank transaction monitoring effort.

These steps while absolutely necessary, are not likely to be sufficient. In the final analysis, though, this war will be won or lost at the *political and ideological* level.

How to Wage Ideological War against the Islamofascists

In our recent book entitled *War Footing: Ten Steps America Must Take to Prevail in the War for the Free World* (www.WarFooting.com), my colleagues and I described how President Reagan waged political warfare against the last horrific totalitarian movement seeking world domination – Soviet Communism. To summarize, these involve:

...Marshal[ing] an array of energy, financial, legal, and security measures [and] “integrat[ing them] within an overall strategy of *political warfare*, a form of war that specifically attacks the ideological and psychological factors that motivate our enemies.

Political and psychological warfare strategies are designed to undermine and divide the enemy: splitting apart and peeling away the enemy’s support base; denying the enemy the social support infrastructure that shelters its forces, funds its operations, and provides its cadres; pitting enemy factions against one another; and discrediting the ideological belief system that legitimizes its cause.

In *War Footing*, we offer a number of specific recommendations about how America could implement such strategies at this juncture. They include the following:

- 1. Stop evading the issue.** No government strategy to date for the so-called “War on Terror” has included political warfare as an element of the American arsenal.
- 2. Devise, staff up, and begin executing a political warfare strategy.** Countering the Islamofascist ideology must be its principal focus.
- 3. De-legitimize Islamist extremism in the eyes of Muslims, and especially its potential supporters.** We need to show that, although violent Islamism is certainly a problem for us in the West, it is a vastly greater problem for the Muslim community.
 - **Challenge the Islamists on religious grounds.** Many Muslim leaders teach the message of civility and tolerance, and their voices need to be amplified. We can help call attention to contradictions between Islamism and the Koran, on such matters as prohibitions of violence against Muslims; relations between Muslims and “people of the book” (Jews and Christians); the ban on compulsion in religion; the doctrine of jihad; the rules of war; killing of innocent civilians, prohibition of suicide, and so forth.
 - **Expose economic disaster.** There is ample evidence that Islamism, and its imposition of *Shari’a* law, results in crippling limitations to economic development, and thus to the socioeconomic well-being of Muslims. Relevant cases are Pakistan, Iran, Sudan, and Nigeria.

- **Celebrate educational opportunity.** Radical Islam has a strongly negative effect on educational standards, due to its narrow emphasis on Koranic instruction which fails to equip graduates with any practical job skills, destining them for jihad or unemployment. Where Islamists hold sway, an erosion in quality similarly afflicts what had been *secular* educational systems. There is evidence, moreover, that with the proliferation of madrassa education, functional illiteracy is spreading, and literacy rates for women are stagnating. Any serious effort at political warfare must emphasize the huge costs to societies that do not fully use the talents of half of their population.
- **Emphasize progress.** *Shari'a*-ruled countries exhibit a strong bias against science and technology education, to the huge detriment of their economic development. The 2004 UN Report on Arab Human Development shows that the Arab world has yet to join the Industrial Revolution – let alone the *Information* Revolution – and that it neither produces much scientific literature nor carries out real research. A successful political warfare strategy must highlight this key failure by documenting the numerous religious prohibitions and restrictions on scientific and technological pursuit imposed by Islamist ideology.
- **Enshrine human rights.** The regular and officially sanctioned abuse of basic human rights in *Shari'a*-dominated countries is yet another glaring Islamist misdeed that needs to be exposed. Such abuse includes the widespread judicial and customary discrimination and outright mistreatment of women, from uncivilized practices such as forced marriages to truly inhumane treatment such as genital mutilation and “honor” killings. Virtually all of these extreme Islamist tenets and practices stand in direct contradiction to the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights – an international human rights standard to which all of the *Shari'a*-dominated countries nominally adhere.

4. Use legislative vehicles for political warfare. Congress has an important role to play. The groundbreaking 1972 Jackson-Vanik Amendment made favorable trade relations with the Soviet Union contingent on its permitting free emigration. Under the leadership of the remarkable Senator Henry M. Jackson, this legislation proved to be a powerful congressionally created political weapon, one that was used to decisive effect in delegitimizing totalitarian Soviet Communism. Sanctions legislation and assistance to democratic opposition movements can serve a similar purpose in the War for the Free World.

5. Use our strengths. The good news is that Americans are among the world’s experts at political warfare. The bad news is that *we mainly use it against each other*: After all, the strategies and tactics of any hard-fought election campaign are precisely the stuff of applied political warfare. The talent, creativity, ingenuity, and, yes, ruthlessness of top-flight political campaign strategists of both parties should be mustered for the purpose of fighting our enemies and helping our friends rather than fighting each other.

The model for such an effort is the “dollar-a-year man,” the highly skilled private-sector leaders who volunteered their services to the government to assist in the World War II effort. With this kind of help, we could quickly be well on the way to building a national

political warfare capability.

6. Invest in the instruments of political warfare, including public diplomacy. Public diplomacy, intended to influence perceptions, attitudes, and actions abroad, must be viewed as a form of political warfare. We have been dramatically underfunding an important area of natural American expertise and capability: multimedia communications aimed at foreign audiences. As part of our War Footing strategy, we must stop nickel-and-diming our international broadcasting operations. All too frequently in recent years, we have increased transmission to one region at the expense of reducing it to another.

An immediate and sweeping ramp-up of our international broadcasting capabilities is needed to provide high-quality programming:

- Voice of America; “free radios”; new services like Radio Sawa and Al Hurra; and support for the extremely effective private-sector broadcasts (for example, those beamed into Iran from Los Angeles and more innovative, sometimes covertly sponsored forms).
- A range of formats (television, satellite, AM/FM or shortwave radio or both, and the Internet).
- Operating twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, where appropriate.
- Serving every country currently or potentially under assault from Islamism.

The cost of such an ambitious undertaking – though appreciably greater than the stingy investment we are making in international communications today – pales by comparison with the costs of military warfare. The investment will be well repaid if it helps us protect and expand the Free World against the Islamists and their friends, without resorting to further use of military force.

7. Use the Internet as a tool of political warfare. In particular, the power of creative Web sites, Webcasting, and blogging should be aggressively exploited.

8. Strengthen the CIA clandestine services, and authorize and fund them for long-term strategic political warfare.

9. Grant the Department of Defense the primary responsibility for political warfare. Just as the State Department leads in public diplomacy, the “warfare” side of communications is legitimately a Pentagon function and must not be assigned to our diplomats.

10. Don’t forget political warfare in non-Islamist areas. The United States must combat adversarial political warfare wherever it arises, even in countries traditionally considered friendly. Despite their differences, the United States and Germany continue to

have strong political, economic, cultural, and military ties. Yet the Socialist/Green coalition ruling Germany during the first years of the war went out of bounds in its differences with U.S. policy – to the point of deliberately undermining American security interests for the sake of political gain in domestic elections. When politicians cross the line between opposition and sabotage, the United States must have capabilities to battle them politically.

11. Reinforce and strengthen our friends. By demonstrating that there are not only consequences for opposing us, but also real and tangible benefits from supporting us, we can maximize the chances of our success. Critical in this regard is the American commitment to the continued survival of one of the most exposed countries of the Free World: Israel.

A Status Report

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that much needs to be done in all of these areas. I commend President Bush for the courageous way in which he has begun to talk about the Islamic fascists and the totalitarian ideology they seek to use to justify the destruction of anti-Islamist Muslims and non-Muslims, alike. This is an absolutely essential precondition to other vital steps.

Yet, as the foregoing list suggests, unless the President's rhetoric is backed up with decisive actions – that is, putting the country on a *true war footing*, involving among other things, devising the requisite political warfare strategies and applying proven techniques to execute them – it will neither deserve nor receive the needed support from the American people, let alone translate into victory.

It is imperative, moreover, that U.S. policy be *coherent* and that still is not always the case. For example, it was striking that, in his excellent speech before the Military Officers Association of America on September 5th, President Bush forcefully explained why it is not possible to appease or negotiate with Islamofascists like al Qaeda and its allies. He then proceeded to show convincingly that the behavior and ambitions of such Sunni extremists are shared by their Shia counterparts led by Iran. Yet, his State Department is actively promoting the notion that we can safely and successfully engage in negotiations with Islamofascists like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the ruling mullahs in Tehran.

Friends and foes alike are affected in ways harmful to our interests by such a manifest lack of consistency and principle. (One case in point is the recent, increasingly aggressive behavior of Iran, both directly on the nuclear issue and in Iraq and through its proxy, Hezbollah, in Lebanon. Another is the deal recently struck by our putative ally, Pakistan with tribal leaders in its western territories, affording what amounts to a safe haven there for al Qaeda.) The same applies to the American people.

The Enemy Within

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that America's current totalitarian foe enjoys an advantage of which its forerunners could only have dreamt: Thanks in large measure to an investment by Saudi Arabia going back three decades and costing many tens of billions of dollars, there is in place in this country an apparatus that is at best sympathetic to the Islamists, and at worst an incipient Fifth Column.

This apparatus has a substantial organizational footprint all across the United States. Its elements include: mosques and associated religious schools (*madrassas*), by some estimates 80% of which have their financing provided by Saudi Arabia; indoctrination efforts on college campuses; recruitment programs run under the guise of prison and military chaplain programs; and front organizations responsible for political influence operations aimed at professional, ecumenical, media and governmental targets.

The Bush Administration, the Congress and the press must be alive to the danger posed by such entities and their activities. This is especially true insofar as these organizations have realized that, by cloaking themselves as adherents to *a religion* rather than an ideological movement, they can exploit civil liberties afforded by tolerant liberal democracies to undermine them.

Yet, to an astonishing degree, nearly five years into the active phase of this War for the Free World, we continue to treat many of these organizations – notably, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the Islamic Society of North America, the Muslim Students Associations and others associated with and/or funded by the Saudi-directed Muslim World League – as though they are what they purport to be: legitimate leaders of the Muslim-American and Arab-American communities and both necessary and valued interlocutors with those communities.

In my view, such organizations do not represent the majority of this country's Muslims or Arabs. It is a strategic mistake of the first order to legitimate their bid to do so by: having senior U.S. government officials meet with and seek the counsel of their representatives, allowing such groups to shape – let alone dictate – policy or entrust to them such tasks as “Muslim sensitivity training” for the FBI, military or other agencies.

The Islamist footprint in America places a special premium on having robust intelligence sources and methods and effective cooperation between the intelligence and law enforcement communities. Since U.S. soil is also a theater in the War for the Free World, it behooves us to ensure that the Commander-in-Chief's inherent powers to intercept and monitor battlefield communications remains unencumbered, even when at least one of the parties to such communications is in the United States.

Conclusion

In short, Mr. Chairman, we confront a complex, multifaceted and increasingly dangerous world. Islamofascists are on the march. They benefit from the state-sponsorship of oil-rich regimes that subscribe to one strain or another of this totalitarian ideology. Such wealth and the determination to destroy us that is a central purpose of our

enemies makes it – all other things being equal – *just a matter of time* before their attacks on us and/or our allies are inflicted with weapons of mass destruction.

To make matters worse, governments that are not themselves Islamist (such as that of Vladimir Putin in Russia, the Communist Chinese, Kim Jong Il's regime in North Korea and Hugo Chavez's in Venezuela) are aiding and abetting the Islamofascists.

This combination of factors leaves us no choice but to get far more serious about this war than we have been to date. Serious in terms of the nature of the enemy. Serious in terms of what it will take to defeat it – from a vastly larger investment in our military to the mobilization of our people, resources and energies. And serious about adopting the policies and programs, including counter-ideological political warfare-related ones, necessary to ensure that we prevail in this War for the Free World.

I hope that my observations today will help this Committee and the Congress play their respective, indispensable roles in achieving that level of seriousness.